

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-8, 10-34, 36-56, 61 and 66-68 were previously pending in the present application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-8, 10-34, 36-56, 61 and 66-68 have been rejected.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 27, and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Applicants respectfully disagree. However, to expedite prosecution, the Applicants amend Claims 1 and 27 to more clearly comply with the written description requirement.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Within the Office Action, Claims 3 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Accordingly, the Applicants amend Claims 1 and 3 to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the cited limitations.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 15-20, 22-29, 34, 36-39, 41-46, 48-53, 55, 56, 61, and 66-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0078230 to Hals et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Hals").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because each and every element set forth in Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 15-20, 22-29, 34, 36-38, 41-46, 48-52, 61, and 67 is not found in Hals, either expressly nor inherently described. Specifically, Hals does not describe a system for providing travel information to an end user "wherein ... [a] search result comprises any of travel information content and a link to travel information content, wherein said travel information content comprises static information and dynamic information, wherein said dynamic information comprises local events corresponding to said destination ... [and] wherein said search result provides both interest information and destination information if said context determination module determines that said phrase corresponds to both said interest and said destination."

Hals involves determining a web site navigation path for users based on one or more search terms. More particularly, Hals deals with filtering websites of pornographic and obscene material on the basis of particular search terms and only providing G-rated content. However, Hals does not involve returning search results based on dynamic information comprises local events corresponding to said destination that corresponds to both an interest and a destination. On page 19 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests that paragraph [0039] of Hals discloses these limitations. However, the cited portion merely discusses how external events can influence the navigation path provided to a user. Hals does not discuss how destination information affects search results, nor does Hals imply that interest information and destination information are both used to suggest local events to an end user.

On the contrary, Claims 1 and 27 recite this limitation explicitly and Claims 3, 8, 10-12, 15-20, 22-26, 28-29, 34, 36-38, 41-46, 48-52, 61, and 67 contain the limitation by reference to Claims 1 and 27. For at least this reason, Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 15-20, 22-29, 34, 36-38, 41-46, 48-52, 61, and 67 are not anticipated by Hals.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Hals in view of Bollay**

Also within the Office Action, Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals in view of United States Patent No. 6,457,009 to Bollay (hereinafter referred to as "Bollay").

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Hals nor Bollay, either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31.

Specifically neither Hals nor Bollay teach or suggest a system for providing travel information to an end user "wherein ... [a] search result comprises any of travel information content and a link to travel information content, wherein said travel information content comprises static information and dynamic information, wherein said dynamic information comprises local events corresponding to said destination ... [and] wherein said search result provides both interest information and destination information if said context determination module determines that said phrase corresponds to both said interest and said destination."

As explained above, Hals does not disclose these features. Additionally, Bollay does not teach or suggest the limitations. The disclosure of Bollay is narrowly limited to querying multiple Internet resident databases from a browser. Bollay never discusses how destination information affects search results, nor

does Hals imply that interest information and destination information are both used to suggest local events to an end user, nor does the Examiner suggest that it does.

On the contrary, Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31 recite this limitation by reference to Claims 1 and 27. For at least this reason, Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31 are not rendered obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Hals and Bollay.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Hals in view of Fries**

Also within the Office Action, Claims 6, 7, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals in view of United States Patent No. 6,601,059 to Fries (hereinafter referred to as "Fries"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Hals nor Fries, either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31.

Specifically neither Hals nor Bollay teach or suggest a system for providing travel information to an end user "wherein ... [a] search result comprises any of travel information content and a link to travel information content, wherein said travel information content comprises static information and dynamic information, wherein said dynamic information comprises local events corresponding to said destination ... [and] wherein said search result provides both interest information and destination information if said context determination module determines that said phrase corresponds to both said interest and said destination."

As explained above, Hals does not disclose these features. Additionally, Fries does not disclose teach or suggest the limitations. As explained by the Examiner, Fries involves providing a visual cue to a user indicating that a search query includes a misspelled word. However, Fries never discusses how destination information affects search results, nor does Hals imply that interest information and destination information are both used to suggest local events to an end user, nor does the Examiner suggest that it does.

On the contrary, Claims 6, 7, 32, and 33 recite this limitation by reference to Claims 1 and 27. For at least this reason, Claims 6, 7, 32, and 33 are not rendered obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Hals and Bollay.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Hals in view of Wilder**

Also within the Office Action, Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals in view of United States Patent No. 5,408,417 to Wilder (hereinafter referred to as "Wilder"). To expedite prosecution, the Applicants currently amend Claims 1 and 27 to include limitations from Claim 13 and cancel Claim 13. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection, because neither Hals nor Wilder, either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claims 1, 14, and 27.

Specifically neither Hals nor Bollay teach or suggest a system for providing travel information to an end user "wherein ... [a] search result comprises any of travel information content and a link to travel information content, wherein said travel information content comprises static information and dynamic information, wherein said dynamic information comprises local events corresponding to said destination ... [and] wherein said search result provides both interest information and destination information if said context determination module determines that said phrase corresponds to both said interest and said destination."

As explained above, Hals does not disclose these features. Additionally, Wilder does not disclose teach or suggest the limitations. Within the Office Action, the Examiner points to Col. 3, Lines 8-13 to support the contention that Wilder involves "dynamic information compris[ing] local events corresponding to [a] destination." However, this cited portion merely involves continuously playing commercials on a ticket vending machine for upcoming events for an area. However, the Examiner has overlooked that the cited portion of Wilder does not involve dynamic information that is a product of the search result resulting in a contextual prediction regarding both a user's interests and a destination. On the contrary, Wilder teaches away from dynamic local event content because the commercials taught by Wilder are merely recordings continuously played in a loop. On the other hand, the local information returned to the user of the Applicants' claimed system is dynamic based on individual search queries.

Claims 1 and 27 contain the above-referenced limitation explicitly and Claim 14 contains the limitation by reference to Claim 1. For at least this reason, Claims 1, 14 and 27 are not rendered obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Hals and Wilder.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Hals**

Also within the Office Action, Claims 21, 40, 47, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals.

As explained above, Hals does not describe a system for providing travel information to an end user “wherein … [a] search result comprises any of travel information content and a link to travel information content, wherein said travel information content comprises static information and dynamic information, wherein said dynamic information comprises local events corresponding to said destination … [and] wherein said search result provides both interest information and destination information if said context determination module determines that said phrase corresponds to both said interest and said destination.” On the contrary, Claims 1 and 27 recite this limitation explicitly and Claims 21, 40, and 47 contain the limitation by reference to Claims 1 and 27. For at least this reason, Claims 21, 40, and 47 are not rendered obvious by Hals.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully posits that the pending claims have been distinguished from the art of record, and that all objections to and rejections of the claims have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance. Should the Examiner deem it helpful he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn  
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862